

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application in view of the following remarks. The status of the claims are as presented in Applicants' Amendment of March 16, 2006.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

In his Final Office Action mailed May 24, 2006, the Examiner maintains his rejections from his previous Office Action mailed November 17, 2005 and states that the Applicants' newly added limitation of "wherein the security level for the at least one fact is stored as metadata in the database" for claims 1 and 8 is not supported by the specification. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider his assessment in light of the following:

Support for fact-level security stored as metadata in the database can be found at least in Figure 4 and on pages 13-15 of the specification. Figure 4 "is a block diagram of another **metadata** structure 145, specifically a **measure indicator** 405." Page 13, lines 5-7 (emphasis added). "The measure indicator 405 includes an identifier 410, which identifies the **facts** within the database 110 that are being referred to." Page 13, lines 10-12 (emphasis added). Fact level security is provided through fields in the measure indicator as described on page 15, lines 4-18:

Fact-based redundancy can also be provided, for example, by providing additional security hierarchy fields 418, 419 within the measure indicator 405. By defining for particular measures a security hierarchy, it is possible to grant access to particular users or clients according to levels of fact-based data by defining security hierarchy levels on a measure-by-measure basis. For ultimate flexibility, the **security hierarchy is defined in the measure indicator** both at the broad level in field 418 and at the specific snippet level 419. The definition at these different levels allows the facts to be accessed according to the measure's use within the star structure 300 or fact table 130 being

accessed rather than just having a broad prohibition of accessing certain types of data by certain users or clients.

(emphasis added).

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 8 as presented in Applicants' Amendment of March 16, 2006 are patentably distinct from the teachings of Thurasingham and Hall, either alone or in combination, for the reasons set forth in Applicants' Amendment of March 16, 2006. As claims 2-7 and 9-14 depend from and further limit independent claims 1 and 8, respectively, these claims are in condition for allowance as well.

III. CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and request a Notice of Allowability for the pending claims. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned Attorney of Record if such would expedite the prosecution of the present Application. Although no fees are believed to be due with this Amendment, if it is determined that additional fees are due, or an overcharge has occurred, please charge or credit Deposit Account No. 13-0480, referencing the Attorney Docket Number specified herein.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard V. Wells
Reg. No. 53,757
BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP
2300 Trammell Crow Center
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201
Tel: (214) 978-3006
Fax: (214) 978-3099

Date: August 23, 2006